

Attorney's Docket
01 P 7463 US

18

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed March 16, 2005 ("Final Office Action"). At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 1-36 were pending and stand rejected. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 7, 13, 20-22, 27, and 32, and canceled Claims 4, 10, and 16. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments. In light of the arguments below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1, 4, 7, 10-11, 13, and 16-17 as being unpatentable over Heinmiller et al. Publication No. WO 99/59353 ("*Heinmiller*") in view of Sayers et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,539,237 ("*Sayers*"); Claims 2, 8, and 14 as being unpatentable over *Heinmiller* and *Sayers* in view of Sienel et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,426,942 ("*Sienel*"); Claims 3, 9, and 15 as being unpatentable over *Heinmiller*, *Sayers*, and *Sienel* in view of Baratz et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,742,596 ("*Baratz*"); Claim 5 as being unpatentable over *Heinmiller* and *Sayers* in view of Kimball U.S. Patent No. 5,953,322 ("*Kimball*"), Iwama et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,600,735 ("*Iwama*"), and *Sienel*; and Claims 6, 12, and 18 as being unpatentable over *Heinmiller* and *Sayers* in view of *Iwama*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and assertions therein.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of *Heinmiller* and *Sayers* as proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest elements specifically recited in Applicant's claims, as amended. As an example, the *Heinmiller-Sayers* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following combination of elements specifically recited in independent Claim 1, as amended:

(1) a packet subsystem operable to "determine that the mobile station has registered with the wireless subsystem," and "provide an instruction to the telephone subsystem in response to determining that the mobile station has registered with the wireless subsystem";

(2) a telephone system operable to "receive the instruction from the packet subsystem," and "in response to receiving the instruction, forward a telephone call directed at the telephonic device to the packet subsystem, the forwarding triggered by the mobile station registering with the wireless subsystem."

Attorney's Docket
01 P 7463 US

19

The Examiner argues:

With further regard to receiving instructions from a second (eg. packet) subsystem, Heinmiller teaches that a call to a wired phone can be rerouted to wireless phone which requires communications/instructions between the two systems (page 8, L25 to page 9, L7).

(Final Office Action, page 3, 4th paragraph.)

The Examiner also argues:

Sayers shows full-duplex interaction between the cellular system and the gatekeeper/packet system which reads on "instructions from the packet system" (figures 9-14 and C20, L65 to C21, L7 discloses the gatekeeper requesting data from the HLR). Also, Sayers teaches "... The connection unit 29 includes a hub 23 for interconnecting the private wireless networks 22 and the LANs 24 and for connecting the private network 14-1 to the public networks 8. The hub 23 connects to the router 33 that *directs calls among the public network facilities including the ISDN 28, ..., PSTN 26 and the Internet 24 and the private networks 14*. The private networks 14 use the same protocol as the Internet 25 and connect directly without need for a separate gateway. The connection unit 29 includes gateways 42-1, 42-2, ..., 42-G for connecting the ISDN 28, PBX 43, ..., PSTN 26 which use different protocols than the private networks. (C9, L33-45)

(Final Office Action, page 3, 5th paragraph.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the passages of *Heinmiller* and *Sayers* cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach, or suggest elements (1) and (2). *Heinmiller* discloses a system and method for routing a call. According to *Heinmiller*:

When the calling party 210 places a call to the called party, the first computer readable program code 250 automatically determines the availability of the called party's wireless communication unit 230 (step 310). In response to the called party's wireless communication unit 230 being determined unavailable, the second computer readable program code 260 automatically routes the call to the called party's landline communication unit 220 (step 320).

(*Heinmiller*, page 4, lines 1-8.) That is, *Heinmiller* discloses that *when a call is placed*, code determines whether a wireless communication unit is available, and routes the call to a landline communication unit if the wireless communication unit is unavailable.

According to *Heinmiller*, a service control point (SCP) determines the availability of a wireless communication unit in the following manner:

First, SCP 460 sends a location request to the HLR 480 of the MSC 470 (step 610). ... Upon receiving the request, the HLR 480 determines the routing address of the wireless communication unit 420 and sends a response containing the routing address, if available, to the SCP 460 (step 620). ... If

Attorney's Docket
01 P 7463 US

20

the response contains the routing address of the wireless communication unit 420 and does not indicate that the wireless communication unit 420 is inactive ..., the SCP 460 sends a forward call command to the SSP 430 (step 640), and the call is routed through the MSC 470 to the wireless communication unit 420 (step 570).

(*Heinmiller*, page 6, line 20–page 7, line 5.) That is, *Heinmiller* discloses that the service control point *sends a request* to determine the availability of a wireless communication unit *when a call is placed*. The point at which a call is placed to a landline communication unit is clearly distinct from the point at which a wireless communication unit registers. As an example, the wireless communication unit may register before or after the call is placed to the landline communication unit. Thus, *Heinmiller* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest providing any instruction *when a wireless communication unit registers* or forwarding a call *in response to the instruction*, where *the forwarding is triggered by the mobile station registering with the wireless subsystem*.

Sayers discloses a communication system formed by a private network that includes a private wireless network. (*Sayers*, Abstract.) As pointed out by the Examiner, *Sayers* discloses, “The hub 23 connects to the router 33 that directs calls among the public network facilities including the ISDN 28, ..., PSTN 26 and the Internet 24 and the private networks 14.” (*Sayers*, column 9, lines 37–40.) *Sayers*, however, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest providing any instruction *when a wireless communication unit registers* or forwarding a call *in response to the instruction*, where *the forwarding is triggered by the mobile station registering with the wireless subsystem*.

Thus, the *Heinmiller-Sayers* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a packet subsystem operable to “determine that the mobile station has registered with the wireless subsystem,” and “provide an instruction to the telephone subsystem in response to determining that the mobile station has registered with the wireless subsystem,” or a telephone system operable to “receive the instruction from the packet subsystem,” and “in response to receiving the instruction, forward a telephone call directed at the telephonic device to the packet subsystem, the forwarding triggered by the mobile station registering with the wireless subsystem.”

As another example, the *Heinmiller-Sayers* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following combination of elements specifically recited in independent Claim 1, as amended:

Attorney's Docket
01 P 7463 US

21

(3) a packet subsystem operable to "determine that the mobile station has deregistered with the wireless subsystem," and "provide a second instruction to the telephone subsystem in response to determining that the mobile station has deregistered with the wireless subsystem, the second instruction instructing the telephone system to forward a telephone call directed at the mobile station to the telephonic device, the forwarding triggered by the mobile station deregistering with the wireless subsystem."

As discussed above, *Heinmiller* discloses that *when a call is placed*, code determines whether a wireless communication unit is available, and routes the call to a landline communication unit if the wireless communication unit is unavailable. The service control point *sends a request* to determine the availability of a wireless communication unit *when a call is placed*. *Heinmiller*, however, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest providing any instruction *when a wireless communication unit deregisters*. Moreover, *Sayers* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest providing any instruction *when a wireless communication unit deregisters*.

Thus, the *Heinmiller-Sayers* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a packet subsystem operable to "determine that the mobile station has deregistered with the wireless subsystem," and "provide a second instruction to the telephone subsystem in response to determining that the mobile station has deregistered with the wireless subsystem, the second instruction instructing the telephone system to forward a telephone call directed at the mobile station to the telephonic device, the forwarding triggered by the mobile station deregistering with the wireless subsystem."

Accordingly, the *Heinmiller-Sayers* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the combination of elements specifically recited in independent Claim 1. For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over the references of the rejection.

The dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claim and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the references of the rejection. Because Applicant believes he has amply demonstrated the allowability of Claim 1 over the references of the rejection, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicant has not provided additional detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicant, however, remains ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so.

Attorney's Docket
01 P 7463 US

22

Independent Claims 7 and 13 are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed with reference to elements (1) through (3). Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 7 and 13, together with their dependent claims.

The Examiner rejects under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 20-22, 26-29, and 32-34 as being unpatentable over *Heinmiller* and *Sayers* in view of *Kimball* and *Iwama*; Claims 23, 30, and 35 as being unpatentable over *Heinmiller*, *Sayers*, *Kimball*, and *Iwama* in view of *Sienel*; and Claims 23, 30, and 35 as being unpatentable over *Heinmiller*, *Sayers*, *Kimball*, and *Iwama* in view of *Baratz*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and assertions therein.

Independent Claims 20, 21, 22, 27, and 32 are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed with reference to elements (1) through (3). Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 20, 21, 22, 27, and 32, together with their dependent claims.

Allowed Claims

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claim 19.

Attorney's Docket
01 P 7463 US

23

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179 of Siemens Information & Communications Products, L.L.C.

Date: May 13, 2005

CUSTOMER NUMBER 28524
SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

Respectfully requested,

By: Thomas George
Thomas George
Registration No. 45,740
Attorney for Applicants
Tel: 650-694-5191
Fax: 650-968-4517